

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,960	07/03/2003	Olgica Bakajin	IL-11046	6753
James S. Tak	7590 03/12/2007		EXAM	INER
Assistant Laboratory Counsel			MENON, KRISHNAN S	
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory P.O. Box 808, L-703		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Livermore, CA	Livermore, CA 94551		1723	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/613,960	BAKAJIN ET AL.	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Krishnan S. Menon	1723	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 05 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP			
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date 	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o e with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	ice, which FR 41.31; or (3)
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A		in the final rejection, whi	ichever is later. In
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is		-	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date.	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Office	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further con(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NO¯ w);	ΓE below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially re-	ducing or simplifying t	he issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all 		time also file de amoundance	må
non-allowable claim(s).			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ wil vided below or appended.	l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	•	•	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-15,17-19,45 and 46</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>20-44</u> . <u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>	1		
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail se 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
 In the request for reconsideration has been considered but attached. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
·			
		Krishnan S Menon Primary Examiner	

Art Unit: 1723

Advisory Action

Applicant's amendment will be entered because it reduces the number of issues on appeal. Claims stand rejected on the prior arts as indicated in the final action of 9/20/06.

Arguments are not persuasive. The argument that the flow process in Noca is not pressurized is not commensurate in scope with the claims because claims do not have any recitation pertaining to a pressurizing.

Argument that Noca does not teach a cover as claimed is also not persuasive.

The cited paragraph of Noca, column 10 lines 47-67 teaches a cover to the "array sieve" of figure 5. The reference teaches that "... the cap layer (66) makes intimate contact with the array sieve (54), while maintaining a uniform separation from the existing substrate (42)." Thus, the reference teaches an intimate contact between the nano fibers of array (54), if not "compress" them, and the cover (66). The reference also teaches:

Such a cap layer 66 could be formed by any conventional MEMS process, such as growth or deposition over a sacrificial layer (not shown) deposited to encapsulate the self-assembled nano-array sieve 54 wherein the sacrificial layer is subsequently removed to expose the self-assembled nano-array sieve 54 itself.

It is very clear from this teaching that the nano-array sieve (54) is first encapsulated with a sacrificial material, then the cover layer is deposited, and then the sacrificial material is removed to expose the nano-array (54). Thus the cover is formed over the nanoarray (54), with intimate contact with the nano-array, so that there is no "gap" between the nanoarray and the cover.

Art Unit: 1723

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krishnan S. Menon whose telephone number is 571-272-1143. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Krishnan S Menon Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1723